



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/540,002	06/21/2005	Naruyasu Ishibashi	271117US0PCT	8043
22850	7590	02/12/2008	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			HANOR, SERENA L	
1940 DUKE STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			1793	
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/12/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/540,002	Applicant(s) ISHIBASHI ET AL.
	Examiner SERENA L. HANOR	Art Unit 4116

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-14 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-14 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-166/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-3 and 6, drawn to a high dispersible hydrophobic fine silica powder.

Group II, claim(s) 7-14, drawn to a production method of a high dispersible hydrophobic fine silica powder, wherein a hydrophobic agent comprising a volatile organic silicon compound is mixed in the gas state with a fine silica powder in a fluidized bed type reaction vessel.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the claimed silica powder as well as a vapor phase method of making said silica powder are known in the art.

Unity exists only when there is a technical relationship among the claimed inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding claimed technical features. The express "special technical features" is defined as meaning those technical features that define a contribution which each of the inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art." (Rule 13.2). The question of unity of invention has

been reconsidered retroactively by the examiner in view of the search performed; a review of Mitsuhashi et al (US 4,640,882), Takiguchi et al (US 5,137,796), Tamaka et al (US 5,306,588), and Komai et al (US 6,077,640) makes it clear that the claimed species is not novel over the prior art (the instantly claimed compounds). Mitsuhashi et al discloses fine silica particles synthesized by the dry process mixed with an aminosilane coupling agent with a hydrophobicity of 51, a triboelectric charge of 190 μ C/g, and a specific surface area of about 200 m^2/g (Example 1, col. 11 lines 14-33; Example 4, col. 12 lines 34-54). Takiguchi et al discloses a magnetic developer comprising a hydrophobic silica fine powder made by a vapor phase method with a BET specific surface area of 70-300 m^2/g , a triboelectric chargeability of -100 to -300 μ C/g, and a hydrophobicity of at least 90% (Claims 1 and 10, and col. 20 lines 59-68). Tamaka et al discloses a fine silica powder with a BET of 50-400 m^2/g (col. 5 lines 37-41) and a triboelectric charge greater than -500 μ C/g (Table 1, col. 23-24). Tamaka et al also discloses that fine silica particles can be treated with silane coupling agents in the vapor phase (col. 12 lines 16-23). Finally, Komai et al discloses a fine powder of hydrophobic metal oxide, wherein the metal oxide can be silica, with a hydrophobicity of at least 60, and a triboelectrification to iron powder of -400 to +400 μ C/g made by mixing said fine powder with ammonia gas, which is a side product in the treatment of the fine metal oxide powder with a silazane (Claims 1-2, 6-7, 17-18). Furthermore, these references appear to demonstrate that the technical feature (i.e. a high dispersible hydrophobic fine silica powder) does not define a contribution which each of the inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. Thus, lack of unity becomes apparent "a

posteriori" after taking the prior art into consideration. Accordingly, the prior art of the record supports restriction of the claimed subject matter in to the groups as mentioned immediately above.

Rejoinder Practice

3. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double

patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Telephone Election

4. A telephone call was made to Mr. Daniel Pereira on 01/08/08 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Joint Inventors

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

6. Claims 1-3 and 6-14 are subject to a Restriction Requirement.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SERENA L. HANOR whose telephone number is (571)270-3593. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vickie Kim can be reached on (571) 272-0579. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLH

/Vickie Kim/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4116